

Fractional Statistics and Chern-Simons Field Theory in 2+1 Dimensions

Avinash Khare*

Institute of Physics, Sachivalaya Marg,
Bhubaneswar 751005, India.
Email: khare@iopb.res.in

Abstract

The question of anyons and fractional statistics in field theories in 2+1 dimensions with Chern-Simons (CS) term is discussed in some detail. Arguments are spelled out as to why fractional statistics is only possible in two space dimensions. This phenomenon is most naturally discussed within the framework of field theories with CS term, hence as a prelude to this discussion I first discuss the various properties of the CS term. In particular its role as a gauge field mass term is emphasized. In the presence of the CS term, anyons can appear in two different ways i.e. either as soliton of the corresponding field theory or as a fundamental quanta carrying fractional statistics and both approaches are elaborated in some detail.

* To be Published in INSA (Indian National Science Academy) Book 2000

1 Introduction

Many of us have wondered some time or the other if one can have nontrivial science and technology in two space dimensions; but the usual feeling is that two space dimensions do not offer enough scope for it. This question, to the best of my knowledge, was first addressed in 1884 by E.A. Abbot in his satirical novel *Flatland* [1]. The first serious book on this topic appeared in 1907 entitled *An episode of Flatland* [2]. In this book C.H. Hinton offered glimpses of the possible science and technology in the flatland. A nice summary of these two books appeared as a chapter entitled *Flatland* in a book in 1969 edited by Martin Gardner [3]. Inspired by this summary, in 1979 A.K. Dewdney [4] published a book which contains several laws of physics, chemistry, astronomy and biology in the flatland. However, all these people missed one important case where physical laws are much more complex, nontrivial and hence interesting in the flatland than in our three dimensional world. I am referring here to the case of quantum statistics. In last two decades it has been realized that whereas in three and higher space dimensions all particles must either be bosons or fermions (i.e. they must have spin of $n\hbar$ or $(2n + 1)\hbar/2$ with $n=0,1,2,\dots$ and must obey Bose-Einstein or Fermi-Dirac statistics respectively), in two space dimensions the particles can have any fractional spin and can satisfy *any* fractional statistics which is interpolating between the two. The particles obeying such statistics are generically called as *anyons* [5]. In other words, if one takes one anyon slowly around the other then in general the phase acquired is $\exp(\pm i\theta)$. If $\theta = 0$ or π (modulo 2π) then the particles are bosons or fermions respectively while if $0 < \theta < \pi$ then the particles are termed as anyons.

From our experience with fermions and bosons it is well known that the question of spin and statistics can be properly handled only within the formalism of relativistic quantum field theory. Thus it is of interest to enquire if one can also understand the ideas of anyons and fractional statistics within the formalism of relativistic quantum field theory. This is the issue that we would like to discuss in this article.

Before I go into the details, one might wonder if our discussion is merely of academic interest? The answer to the question is no. In fact it is a surprising fact that two, one and even zero dimensional experimental physics is possible in our three-dimensional world. This is because of the third law of thermodynamics, which states that all the degrees of freedom freeze out

in the limit of zero temperature, it is possible to strictly confine the electrons to surfaces, or even to lines or points. Thus it may happen that in a strongly confining potential, or at sufficiently low temperatures, the excitation energy in one or more directions may be much higher than the average thermal energy of the particles, so that those dimensions are effectively frozen out. Of course, even then, at the basic level, the fundamental particles are certainly fermions or bosons. However, the most direct and appropriate discussion of the low energy behavior of a material is usually in terms of the quasi-particles. The hope is that at least in some of these cases the quasi-particles could be anyons. This hope has in fact been realized in the case of the fractionally quantized Hall effect where the quasi-particles are believed to be charged vortices i.e. charged anyons [6]. Recent experiments [7] seem to confirm the existence of fractionally charged excitations and hence indirectly of anyons.

The plan of the article is the following. In Sec.II, I first spell out as to why fractional statistics is only possible in two space dimensions. It turns out that the phenomenon of fractional statistics is most naturally discussed within the framework of field theories with CS term. As a prelude to this discussion, in Sec.III, I discuss the various properties of the CS term. In particular its role as a gauge field mass term and its behavior under the discrete transformations of parity (P) and time-reversal (T) is emphasized. In the presence of the CS term, anyons can appear in two different ways (i.e. either as soliton of the corresponding field theory or as fundamental quanta carrying fractional statistics) and both approaches are elaborated in some detail in the next three sections. The charged vortex solutions in Abelian Higgs model with CS term are obtained in Sec.IV, and it is pointed out that these charged vortices represent the first relativistic model for (extended) charged anyons. I also construct the charged vortex solutions in pure CS theory in both the relativistic and the non-relativistic settings. In Sec.V, I discuss an example of neutral relativistic anyons by considering the soliton solutions in the CP^1 model with the Hopf term which is one of the *avatars* of the CS term. Finally, in Sec.VI, I elaborate upon the other approach in which fundamental fields of theories with CS term themselves carry fractional spin and obey fractional statistics.

2 Why Anyons in Only Two Dimensions?

Before we come to the question of fractional statistics, it might be worthwhile to understand as to why unlike in three and higher space dimensions, the eigenvalue of the spin angular momentum operator can take any fractional value in units of $\hbar$. The point is that the spin in two dimensions differs fundamentally from the spin in higher dimensions. This is because whereas in three and higher space dimensions, the spin angular momentum algebra is non-commutative i.e.

$$[S_i, S_j] = i\hbar\varepsilon_{ijk}S_k; \quad i, j, k = 1, 2, 3 \quad (1)$$

in two space dimensions, it is a trivial commutative algebra since only one generator (say S_3) is available which obviously commutes with itself. As a result, there is no analogue of the quantization of the angular momentum, which arises in three and higher space dimensions from the nonlinear commutation relation (1). Here ε_{ijk} is the completely antisymmetric tensor.

Now, in relativistic quantum field theory, there is a deep and profound connection between the spin and the statistics i.e. particles with half integer spin are fermions, satisfying Fermi-Dirac statistics, while those with integer spin are bosons, satisfying Bose-Einstein statistics. This immediately suggests that in two dimensions the particles may exhibit fractional (i.e. any) statistics. In a remarkable paper Leinaas and Myrheim [8] showed that this is indeed so. Before we come to a proper discussion about the statistics, it is worth clarifying as to what exactly one means by quantum statistics. In most text books on statistical mechanics, the term “quantum statistics” refers to the phase picked up by a wave function when two identical particles are interchanged, i.e, under the permutation of the particles. But this is slightly misleading and has been correctly criticized in the literature [9]. If the particles are *strictly identical*, the word permutation has no physical meaning since a given configuration and the one obtained by the permutation of the particle coordinates are merely two different ways of describing the *same* particle configuration. The term quantum statistics actually refers to the phase that arises when two particles are adiabatically transported giving rise to the exchange. In this book, we shall be concentrating on this definition of quantum statistics. It is a coincidence that in three and higher dimensions, the two definitions, based on the permutation and the adiabatic exchange of

two particles, coincide, but in two dimensions the two definitions give very different answers.

The key reason for the fractional statistics in two dimensions is the principle of indistinguishability of identical particles. It is one of the most important characteristics of quantum mechanics (vis a vis classical mechanics) and it has profound physical consequences. The principle is in fact older than quantum mechanics. It was introduced by John Willard Gibbs even in classical statistical mechanics to resolve the famous Gibbs paradox. Even though this principle has been with us for a very long time, unfortunately, its full significance was not appreciated till 1977 and that is how one missed the possibility of fractional statistics in two dimensions for all these years.

Following Leinaas and Myrheim [8], let us enquire about the configuration space of a system of identical particles ? Normally one considers the full phase space in statistical mechanics but it turns out that configuration space is enough for this discussion. Suppose one particle space is X . Then what is the configuration space of N identical particles ? The Naive answer is X^N , which, even though true locally, is *not correct* globally. Why? The reason is, since the particles are strictly identical, hence there is no distinction between the points in X^N that differ only in the ordering of the particle coordinates. For example, consider the point

$$\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \quad (2)$$

in X^N where $\mathbf{x}_i \in X$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Now consider another point $\mathbf{x}'$ in X^N which is obtained from $\mathbf{x}$ by the permutation p of the particle indices i.e.

$$\mathbf{x}' = P(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{x}_{P^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{P^{-1}(N)}) . \quad (3)$$

Clearly, both describe the *same* physical configuration of the system. Thus the true configuration of the N -particle system is *not* X^N but it is the space X^N/S_N which is obtained by identifying points in X^N that represent the same physical configuration, i.e. it is obtained from X^N by dividing out by the action of the symmetry group S_N . Note that S_N is a discrete, finite group obtained by permutation of N identical particles. As a result, the space X^N/S_N is locally isomorphic to X^N except at its singular points. However, the global properties of the two spaces are very different. Whereas X^N has only regular points when X is regular, those points in X^N/S_N which correspond to a coincidence of the positions of two or more particles are in

fact singular points of X^N/S_N . Thus to calculate the configuration space of identical particles, such singular points must be excluded by say hard-core constraint so that we can determine if two particles have been exchanged or not. This of course does not make much difference classically. However, in the quantum case the global properties of the configuration space are of deep significance and this results in the possibility of fractional statistics. It is worth emphasizing that this is the crux of the whole matter and it is this fact which was missed for about fifty years!

It turns out that the removal of such singular point in two space dimensions makes the space multiply connected while for three and higher space dimensions it is still doubly connected. That is why, in two dimensions it is possible to define paths that wind around the origin an arbitrary number of times counted with orientation. As a consequence, when one quantizes a system of identical particles then one can show that in two dimensions it is possible to consistently assign *any value* to the phase arising due to the exchange of two identical particles. Since in two dimensions one can distinguish the clockwise winding from the anti-clockwise winding, hence without any loss of generality one can assign the phases $e^{+i\theta}$ and $e^{-i\theta}$ respectively, in the case of the anti-clockwise and the clockwise windings.

At this point, it may be worthwhile to mention few key properties of anyons.

1. Anyons must necessarily violate the discrete symmetries of parity (P) and time reversal (T) if $0 < \theta < \pi$ since the clockwise and the anti-clockwise windings have different phase factors.
2. Anyons are sort of in between the bosons and the fermions i.e. the repulsion between two anyons in the ground state monotonically increases as θ goes from 0 to π with there being no repulsion between two bosons. Thus, in a sense, anyons are closer to the fermions than to the bosons since all of them will satisfy a generalized form of Pauli exclusion principle.
3. It turns out that whereas the permutation group which is at the heart of the Bose-Einstein and the Fermi-Dirac statistics, it is the braid group which is at the heart of the fractional statistics. In particular, whereas there are two one dimensional representations of the permutation group

(the identical one and the alternating one, corresponding to the Bose-Einstein and Fermi-Dirac statistics respectively), the braid group admits a continuous parameter family of one dimensional representations which one usually identifies with the parameter θ which characterizes fractional statistics.

4. Is there a relation between the anyonic statistics and the parastatistics ? The answer is *no*. They are built on two different structures i.e. whereas the Parastatistics corresponds to the higher dimensional representation of the permutation group while anyons correspond to the one dimensional representation of the braid group.

Quantum Statistics in One Dimension

Since we have been talking about the possible quantum statistics in various dimensions, hence it may be worthwhile to also talk about the various possibilities in one dimension. Recall that the notion of the spin does not exist in one dimension since there is no axis to rotate about in that case. Similarly the concept of the quantum statistics is not uniquely defined in one dimension since the position of two particles cannot be interchanged without their passing through one another. As a result, the intrinsic statistics is inextricably mixed up with the local interactions. In fact this ambiguity is at the heart of the bosonization technique which allows the same particle to be represented alternatively by a boson or a fermion field. If, however, statistics is defined in terms of the exclusion principle rather than the exchange of identical particles, then it is possible to define quantum statistics in even one dimension [10].

3 Introduction to Chern-Simons Term

We now want to understand how anyons occur in field theory. It turns out that this is possible provided the CS term or its incarnation, the Hopf term are present. It may therefore be worthwhile to first introduce the CS term (in 2+1 dimensions) and discuss its various properties [11].

What is Chern-Simons Term?

Consider the Lagrangian density for classical electrodynamics in 3+1 di-

mensions as given by

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \bar{\psi}(i\gamma_\mu D^\mu - m)\psi \quad (4)$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ and $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu$ is the covariant derivative. This Lagrangian is invariant under the local gauge transformation

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow e^{ie\alpha(x)}\psi(x), \quad A_\mu(x) \rightarrow A_\mu(x) + \partial_\mu\alpha(x). \quad (5)$$

Similarly, for massless fermions ($m=0$), this Lagrangian is also invariant under the (global) chiral transformation

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow e^{i\gamma_5\beta}\psi(x), \quad A_\mu(x) \rightarrow A_\mu(x). \quad (6)$$

The naive expectation was that, these two symmetries i.e. the gauge and the chiral symmetries, which are valid at the classical level, will continue to hold good even in the quantum theory. As a consequence, one expected that the vector and the axial vector currents $j_\mu = \bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\psi$ and $j_\mu^5 = \bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\psi$ which are conserved at the classical level, will continue to remain conserved even in the quantum theory. It has however, been shown that this is not so. There is *no* regularization which can simultaneously preserve both these symmetries at the quantum level. Because of the unexpected result, it was called an anomaly at that time (and unfortunately even today it is called so), even though the correct name should have been quantum mechanical symmetry breaking. Remarkably, the entire effect comes only from one loop diagram and two and higher loops do not contribute to the anomaly. In view of our strong faith in the gauge symmetry, one therefore says that it is the chiral symmetry which is broken by the one loop quantum corrections. In particular, there is a gauge singlet (axial) anomaly in any even dimension, $(2n)$ so that the divergence of the gauge singlet axial current, even for massless fermions, is non-zero and proportional to the corresponding Chern-Pontryagin (CP) density P_{2n} in that (even) dimension $2n$ i.e.

$$\partial^\mu j_\mu^5(x) \propto P_{2n}. \quad (7)$$

It is also well known that the CP Density can always be written as a total divergence

$$P_{2n} = \partial_\mu \Lambda^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 2n-1. \quad (8)$$

The object Λ^μ , for a particular value of μ (say $\mu = 2n-1$) naturally lives in odd $(2n-1)$ dimensions and is known as the CS density in that dimension. Thus, whereas the CP density lives in even space-time dimensions, the CS density lives in odd space-time dimensions. For example, the gauge singlet anomaly in 3+1 dimensional quantum electrodynamics is given by

$$\partial^\mu j_\mu^5 = \frac{e^2}{2\pi} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} F^{\mu\nu} F^{\lambda\sigma} = \frac{e^2}{\pi} \partial^\mu (\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} A^\nu F^{\lambda\sigma}) \quad (9)$$

so that the Abelian CS term in 2+1 dimensions is given by

$$J_{CS} = \int \mathcal{L}_{CS} d^3x \propto \int d^3x \varepsilon_{\nu\lambda\sigma} A^\nu F^{\lambda\sigma}. \quad (10)$$

Throughout this book we shall mainly be concerned with this CS term or its non-Abelian generalization. Let us therefore discuss in some detail the various properties of this term.

Gauge Invariant Mass Term

Let us consider pure electrodynamics in the presence of the Chern-Simons term in 2+1 dimensions [12, 13]

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\mu}{4} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} F_{\mu\nu} A_\lambda. \quad (11)$$

Since the mass dimension of A_μ is 1/2, hence it follows that the parameter μ has the dimension of mass. The field equation following from this Lagrangian can be written as

$$(g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{\mu} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha} \partial_\alpha) {}^*F_\nu = 0 \quad (12)$$

where ${}^*F_\nu$ is the dual field strength which is a vector in 2+1 dimensions i.e.

$${}^*F_\nu = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{\nu\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta}; \quad F_{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha} {}^*F^\alpha. \quad (13)$$

We thus find that, unlike the CP term which has only a nontrivial topology but no dynamics (being a total divergence), the CS term has nontrivial topology as well as dynamics in it. On operating by $(g_{\beta\eta} - \frac{1}{\mu} \varepsilon_{\beta\eta\delta} \partial^\delta)$ to Eq. (12), we get

$$(\square + \mu^2) {}^*F_\beta = 0 \quad (14)$$

which clearly shows that the gauge field excitations are massive with the gauge field mass μ being the coefficient of the CS term. We have thus shown

that the CS term when added to the Maxwell term, acts as the *gauge invariant gauge field mass term*. It is worth adding that this remarkable property of having a gauge invariant mass term for the gauge field in the action itself is very special to 2+1 dimensions.

Behavior Under C, P, and T

Let us consider the behaviour of the CS term as well as the Dirac Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_D = i\bar{\psi}(\gamma_\mu \partial^\mu - m)\psi \quad (15)$$

under the discrete transformations C (charge conjugation), P (parity) and T (time reversal). Here, ψ is a two component spinor with mass $m(> 0)$ and the mass dimension of ψ is 1. We use the following two-dimensional realization of the Dirac algebra

$$\gamma^0 = \sigma^3, \quad \gamma^1 = i\sigma^1, \quad \gamma^2 = i\sigma^2, \quad (16)$$

$$\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu = g^{\mu\nu} - i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha} \gamma_\alpha; \quad g^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag.}(1, -1, -1) \quad (17)$$

where σ^i are the usual Pauli matrices.

It is easily shown that under charge conjugation

$$CA_\mu C^{-1} = -A_\mu, \quad C\psi C^{-1} = \sigma^1 \psi^+ \quad (18)$$

so that the action is invariant under C . On the other hand, under parity transformation, the gauge and the Fermi fields transform as follows

$$PA^{0,2}(t, \mathbf{r})P^{-1} = A^{0,2}(t, \mathbf{r}'), \quad PA^1(t, \mathbf{r})P^{-1} = -A^1(t, \mathbf{r}'), \quad (19)$$

$$P\psi(t, \mathbf{r})P^{-1} = \sigma^1 \psi(t, \mathbf{r}'). \quad (20)$$

Note that in 2+1 dimensions, the parity transformation is somewhat unusual i.e. $\mathbf{r} = (x, y)$, $\mathbf{r}' = (-x, y)$ (or $(x, -y)$). On the other hand, $(-x, -y)$ corresponds to rotation (and not space reflection). As a result, we find that the mass terms for both the Fermi and the gauge fields (i.e. $m\bar{\psi}\psi$ and the CS term) are not invariant under parity. Similarly, time-inversion changes the signs of both the mass terms since

$$TA^0(t, \mathbf{r})T^{-1} = A^0(-t, \mathbf{r}), \quad T\mathbf{A}(t, \mathbf{r})T^{-1} = -\mathbf{A}(-t, \mathbf{r}), \quad (21)$$

$$T\psi(t, \mathbf{r})T^{-1} = \sigma^2 \psi(-t, \mathbf{r}). \quad (22)$$

Thus, both the CS term as well as the fermion mass term, $m\bar{\psi}\psi$ are non-invariant under P as well as T . However, they are invariant under the combined operation PT and hence the CPT symmetry is still valid. Note that in $3+1$ dimensions though, $m\bar{\psi}\psi$ is invariant under P, C and T separately.

Finally, let us talk about the photon spin. One can show that the CS photon spin is $1(-1)$ if CS mass $\mu > 0(< 0)$ while the spin of the massless photon is zero. Further, in either case, the photon has only one degree of freedom.

Coleman - Hill Theorem

It turns out that because of the P and T violating but gauge invariant CS term, the most general form for the vacuum polarization tensor consistent with Lorentz and gauge invariance is more general than in other dimensions i.e.

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu}(k) = (k^2 g_{\mu\nu} - k_\mu k_\nu) \Pi_1(k^2) - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} k^\lambda \Pi_2(k^2). \quad (23)$$

Note that the second term on the right hand side is odd under P and T . It is clear that any P and T violating interaction will contribute to $\Pi_2(k^2)$. For example, the fermion mass term which violates both P and T , does contribute to $\Pi_2(k^2)$ at one loop. Remarkably enough, it was discovered that at two loops, however, there is no contribution to $\Pi_2(0)$ and hence to Chern-Simons mass [11]. Inspired by this result, Coleman and Hill [14] have in fact proved under very general conditions that $\Pi_2(0)$ receives no contribution from two and higher loops in any gauge and Lorentz invariant theory including particles of spin 1 or less (An open question is whether this is also valid for higher spin theories, specially spin-3/2). They only require that the matter fields be massive so that one does not have to worry about the infrared problems. Further, they also assume that no part of the free electro-magnetic Lagrangian density is hiding in the matter part of the Lagrangian. It may be noted that their result is valid even for non-renormalizable interactions in the presence of the gauge and Lorentz invariant regularization.

Coleman and Hill also claimed that at one loop, the only contribution to $\Pi_2(0)$ can come from the fermion loop. This is, however, incorrect. In particular, there is no reason why P and T violating interactions involving spin-0 or spin-1 particles should not contribute to $\Pi_2(0)$ at one loop. In fact, it has been shown that the parity violating spin-0 [15] as well as spin-1 interactions [16] do contribute to $\Pi_2(0)$ at one loop.

Magneto-Electric Effect

There are many crystals in nature like chromium oxide, which show the magneto-electric effect i.e., they also get magnetically polarized in an electric field and electrically polarized in a magnetic field [17, 18]. It is well known that this effect depends upon having a CP -asymmetric medium. Mathematically, the signal for the magneto-electric effect in 2+1 dimensions is that the relation between the excitation fields $\mathbf{D}$ and H and $\mathbf{E}$ and B is modified to

$$D_i = \chi_{ij}^{(e)} E_j + \chi_i^{(em)} B; \quad H = \chi^{(m)} B + \chi_i^{(me)} E_i. \quad (24)$$

It has been shown [19] that the vacuum of the 2 + 1 dimensional quantum electrodynamics with CS term also shows the magneto-electric effect. In particular, it has been shown that both $\chi_i^{(em)}$ and $\chi_i^{(me)}$ are non-zero and proportional to $k_i \Pi_2(k^2)$. Of course this is not really surprising if one remembers that the CS term violates the discrete symmetries P and T .

Chern-Simons Term by Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking

We have seen above that the CS term provides mass to the gauge field. Now, usually the gauge field mass is generated by spontaneous symmetry breaking; hence it is worth enquiring whether the CS term can also be generated by spontaneous symmetry breaking. The answer to the question is yes [20]. This is because, unlike other dimensions, in the 2 + 1 case, one can have a more general definition of the covariant derivative. In particular, it is easily seen that

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \psi = (\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu - ig\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} F^{\nu\lambda})\psi \quad (25)$$

also transforms as a covariant derivative, since the field strength $F^{\nu\lambda}$ by itself is gauge invariant. Obviously, the same thing is also true for a spin-0 charged scalar field. Now consider the following generalized Abelian Higgs model in 2 + 1 dimensions

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{D}_\mu \phi)^*(\mathcal{D}^\mu \phi) - \alpha(|\phi|^2 - a^2)^2 \quad (26)$$

where the generalized covariant derivative is as given by Eq. (25). On expanding the term $\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{D}_\mu \phi)^*(\mathcal{D}^\mu \phi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{D}_\mu \phi)^*(\mathcal{D}^\mu \phi) &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu + ieA_\mu)\phi^*(\partial^\mu - ieA^\mu)\phi + \frac{g^2}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}|\phi|^2 \\ &\quad + ig^*F_\mu(\phi^*\partial^\mu\phi - \phi\partial^\mu\phi^*) + eg\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}(\partial^\mu A^\nu)A^\lambda|\phi|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

so that if ϕ acquires a nonzero vacuum expectation value then the Abelian CS term is generated from the last term of this equation. Clearly a similar mechanism should also work for the non-Abelian case, but technically it is a tougher problem since one also has to generate the non-linear term.

Lorentz Invariance From Gauge Invariance

One of the remarkable properties of the Abelian CS term is that in this case the Lorentz invariance of the action automatically follows from the gauge invariance. In contrast, notice that the most general form of the gauge invariant Maxwell Lagrangian in classical electrodynamics in $3 + 1$ dimensions is

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbf{E}^2 + a\mathbf{B}^2. \quad (28)$$

It is only the demand of the Lorentz invariance which tell us that $a = -1$ (In the $2 + 1$ case, B is a pseudo scalar but the same argument is still valid). On the other hand, if one writes the CS action as

$$I_{CS} = \int d^3x [\varepsilon_{ij} E^i A^j + a B A^0], \quad (29)$$

then the demand of the invariance of I_{CS} under the gauge transformation $A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \alpha$ fixes a and uniquely gives us the CS action which is automatically also Lorentz invariant.

Quantization of Chern-Simons Mass

Let us now discuss the CS term in the non-Abelian gauge theories. We shall mention only those properties which are special to the non-Abelian CS term. To begin with, notice that the non-Abelian CS term has an extra term compared to the Abelian case i.e.

$$I_{na}^{(CS)} = \frac{\mu}{4} \int d^3x \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \text{tr}(F_{\mu\nu} A_\lambda - \frac{2}{3} A_\mu A_\nu A_\lambda) \quad (30)$$

where A_μ and $F_{\mu\nu}$ are matrices

$$A_\mu = gT^a A_\mu^a; \quad F_{\mu\nu} = gT^a F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu]. \quad (31)$$

Here, T^a are the representation matrices of the gauge group G satisfying

$$[T^a, T^b] = f^{abc} T^c \quad (32)$$

where f^{abc} are the structure constants of the group. In the case of $SU(2)$, $T^a = \tau^a/2i$.

Let us now consider a non-Abelian gauge theory with the Chern-Simons term as given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{na} = \frac{1}{2g^2} \text{tr}(F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}) - \frac{\mu}{2g^2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \text{tr}(F_{\mu\nu} A_\lambda - \frac{2}{3} A_\mu A_\nu A_\lambda) \quad (33)$$

As in the Abelian case, it is easily shown that the CS term provides a gauge invariant gauge field mass μ .

As in the Abelian case, the non-Abelian CS Lagrangian density changes by a total derivative under an infinitesimal local gauge transformation so that the corresponding action is invariant under such a gauge transformation. However, the CS action is not invariant under finite (also called homotopically non-trivial, or those which are not continuously deformable to the identity) gauge transformations as given by

$$A_\mu \longrightarrow U^{-1} A_\mu U + U^{-1} \partial_\mu U. \quad (34)$$

As a result, one finds that the action corresponding to the Lagrangian (33) transforms as follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_{na} \longrightarrow & I_{na} + \mu \int d^3x \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \text{tr} \left(\partial_\nu [A_\mu (\partial_\lambda U) U^{-1}] \right) \\ & + \frac{\mu}{3} \int d^3x \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \text{tr} \left[(\partial_\mu U) U^{-1} (\partial_\nu U) U^{-1} (\partial_\lambda U) U^{-1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Let us consider those gauge transformations which tend to the identity at temporal and spatial infinity so as to avoid a convergence problem i.e.

$$U(X) \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow \infty} I. \quad (36)$$

It is now easily seen that the gauge field dependent surface integral in Eq. (35) vanishes. However, the last term in the integral is non-zero. It can be converted to a surface integral once the integrand is rewritten as a total derivative. This can be made manifest by using an explicit parameterization for U . For example, in the case of $SU(2)$ (more generally, we choose $SU(2)$ sub-group of the gauge group G ; for reasons that will be clear soon), one can make use of the exponential parameterization $U(X) = \exp(i\sigma^a \theta^a(x))$. In this way one can show that under large gauge transformations, I_{na} is not invariant but transforms as

$$I_{na} \rightarrow I_{na} + \frac{8\pi^2 \mu}{g^2} \omega(U) \quad (37)$$

where

$$\omega(U) = \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \int d^3x \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \text{tr} \left[(\partial_\mu U) U^{-1} (\partial_\nu U) U^{-1} (\partial_\lambda U) U^{-1} \right] \quad (38)$$

is the winding number of the gauge transformation U . In particular, if the gauge group G is such that the third homotopy group of G is non-trivial i.e.

$$\pi_3(G) = Z \quad (39)$$

where Z is the additive group of integers, then under these so called large gauge transformations, the action transforms as

$$I_{na} \rightarrow I_{na} + \frac{8\pi^2\mu}{g^2} m \quad (40)$$

where m is an integer. Note in particular, that Eq. (39) is true for any gauge group G of which $SU(2)$ is a sub-group. However, in the path integral formulation, the action itself may or may not be gauge invariant but, it is the exponential of the action ($\exp(iI_{na})$) which should be gauge invariant. In this way we conclude that the non-Abelian gauge theory with the CS term does not make sense in $2+1$ dimensions unless the CS mass μ is quantized [13] in units of $g^2/4\pi$ i.e. ($n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$)

$$\frac{8\pi^2\mu}{g^2} = 2\pi n \quad \text{or} \quad \mu = \frac{g^2}{4\pi} n. \quad (41)$$

This mass quantization is reminiscent of the famous Dirac quantization in the case of magnetic monopole. An important question to address is whether the quantization condition (41) is respected by the quantum corrections. This issue was considered by Pisarski and Rao [21] for the case of a pure gauge theory (i.e. without any matter field). They found that the quantization is indeed preserved to one loop; however, the integer on the right hand side of Eq. (41) is shifted by N in case the gauge group $G = SU(N)$. Subsequently, it has been shown that there are no further corrections from two and higher loops in the limit of the pure CS gauge theory [22].

How does the quantization condition modify in the presence of the matter fields? It has been shown that so long as the scalar field does not break the non-Abelian gauge symmetry, then the quantization condition remains unaltered. The massive fermions, of course, modify the quantization condition

[21] ; the right hand side of Eq. (41) being shifted by $\frac{m_f}{|m_f|}T_R$, where T_R is the Casimir generator for the gauge group G (i.e. $\text{tr}(T^a T^b) = -\delta^{ab}T_R$), in case the fermions are in the fundamental representation of the gauge group G . Thus the quantization is preserved so long as T_R is an integer.

Much more interesting is the case of partial (spontaneous symmetry) breaking of a non-Abelian gauge symmetry. In this case it has been shown that if the non-Abelian gauge symmetry $SU(N)$ is spontaneously broken to say $SU(M) \otimes U(1)$ (or even several $U(1)$'s), then the one-loop radiative correction to the right hand side of the quantization condition (41) [23] arises purely from the unbroken non-Abelian sector in question, the orthogonal $U(1)$ sector makes no contribution. This implies that the coefficient of the CS term is a discontinuous function over the phase diagram of the theory.

Parity Anomaly

Is our entire discussion about the CS term merely of academic interest ? Put differently, some one might argue that since the CS term violates both the parity and the time reversal invariance symmetries, why should one, in the first place, add such a term to the action ? The answer to this question, at least in the non-Abelian gauge theories, is that even if one does not add the CS term to the action at the tree level, it is automatically generated by the one loop radiative corrections due to the so called parity anomaly [24]. In particular, consider the action

$$I[A_\mu, \psi] = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2g^2} \text{tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) + i\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu(\partial^\mu - ieA^\mu)\psi \right] \quad (42)$$

for an odd number of massless doublet of fermions in the fundamental representation coupled to $SU(2)$ gauge fields (more generally any gauge group G of which $SU(2)$ is a sub-group so that Eq. (39) is satisfied; and the fermions are required only to be in the fundamental representation).

This action is invariant under the gauge transformations (both large and small) as well as the discrete transformations of parity (P) and time reversal invariance (T). However, the effective action $I_{eff}[A]$, obtained by integrating out the fermionic degrees of freedom, violates one of the two symmetries. In other words, there is *no* regularization which can simultaneously maintain the invariance of $I_{eff}[A]$ under the large gauge transformations as well as P and T . In view of the tremendous success of the gauge principle, one usually maintains the gauge invariance at the cost of the parity and the time reversal invariance by simply adding the CS term to the action (alternately one can

also regulate it by using the P and T violating Pauli-Villars regularization). In this way, one finds that the CS term is induced by the radiative corrections even if it is absent at the tree level. This is very similar to the way the CP term is induced in even dimensions due to the gauge singlet (chiral) anomaly.

Topological Field Theory

One of the most remarkable property of the CS action is that it depends only on the antisymmetric tensor $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}$ and not on the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$. As a result, the CS action in the flat and the curved space is the same. Hence, the CS action, in both the Abelian and the non-Abelian cases, is an example of the topological field theory [25]. It might be mentioned here, that the topological field theories give a natural framework for understanding the Jones polynomials of the Knot theory in terms of three dimensional terms. Further, these theories have shed new light on conformal field theories in two space-time dimensions.

Finally, the gravitational Chern-Simons term has also been considered [13] and shown to have some remarkable properties. In particular, whereas the massless Einstein theory in $2+1$ dimensions is trivial, it acquires a propagating, massive, spin-2 degree of freedom when the CS term is present. Further, even though this topological term has third time derivative dependence, yet the theory is ghost-free and unitary and one has a consistent quantum theory. The contribution of the topological mass term to the field equations also has a natural geometric significance: it is the three dimensional analogue of the Weyl tensor.

4 Charged Vortex as Anyon in Field Theories

In the last section, we have discussed in detail the various properties of the CS term. In this section, we demonstrate the most dramatic effect of this term i.e. the existence of charged vortex solutions thereby providing us with a relativistic model for the charged (extended) anyons.

Before we discuss the charged vortex solutions, it might be worthwhile to mention how such solutions were historically discovered. A long time ago, Abrikosov [26] wrote down the electrically neutral vortex solutions in the Ginzburg-Landau theory which is a mean-field theory of superconductivity. Subsequently, these vortices were experimentally observed in the type-II superconductors. Nielsen and Olesen [27] rediscovered these solutions in the

context of the Abelian Higgs model which is essentially a relativistic generalization of the Ginzburg-Landau theory. These people were looking for string-like objects in relativistic field theory. It turns out that these vortices have finite energy per unit length in $3 + 1$ dimensions (i.e. finite energy in $2 + 1$ dimensions as the vortex dynamics is essentially confined to the x - y plane), quantized flux, but are electrically neutral and have zero angular momentum. Subsequently, Julia and Zee [28] showed that the $SO(3)$ Georgi-Glashow model which admits t'Hooft-Polyakov monopole solution, also admits its charged generalization i.e. the dyon solution with finite energy and finite, non-zero, electric charge. It was then natural for them to enquire whether the Abelian Higgs model, which admits neutral vortex solutions with finite energy (in $2+1$ dimensions), also admits its charged generalization or not. In the appendix of the same paper, Julia and Zee discussed this question and showed that the answer is *no* i.e. unlike the monopole case, the Abelian Higgs model does not admit charged vortices with finite energy and finite and non-zero electric charge. More than ten years later, Samir Paul and I [29] showed that the Julia-Zee negative result can be overcome if one adds the CS term to the Abelian Higgs model. In particular, we showed that the Abelian Higgs model with CS term in $2+1$ dimensions admits charged vortex solutions of finite energy and quantized, finite, Noether charge as well as flux. As an extra bonus, it was found that these vortices also have non-zero, finite angular momentum which is in general fractional. This strongly suggested that these charged vortices could in fact be charged anyons which was subsequently rigorously shown by Fröhlich and Marchetti [30].

Strictly speaking, what one has obtained are the charged soliton solutions and not the vortex solutions, but because of the close connection with the neutral vortex solutions, one has continued to call them as charged vortices rather than charged solitons.

Consider an Abelian Higgs model with CS term as given by

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu\phi)^*(D^\mu\phi) - C_4(|\phi|^2 - \frac{C_2}{2C_4})^2 + \frac{\mu}{4}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}F^{\mu\nu}A^\lambda \quad (43)$$

where μ is the Chern-Simons mass, ϕ denotes complex scalar field and $D_\mu\phi$ is the covariant derivative i.e.

$$D_\mu\phi = (\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu)\phi. \quad (44)$$

Here ϕ, A_μ as well as the gauge coupling constant e have mass dimension of $1/2$ while C_4 and C_2 have mass dimensions of 1 and 2 respectively. In order to obtain the charged vortex solutions, let us consider the following *ansatz*

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}, t) = -e_\theta C_0 \frac{(g(r) - n)}{r}, \quad \phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = C_0 f(r) e^{in\theta}, \quad A_0(\mathbf{x}, t) = C_0 h(r) \quad (45)$$

where $g(r), h(r), f(r)$ are the dimension-less fields, r is the dimension-less length, while C_0 has mass dimension of $1/2$ i.e.

$$r = eC_0\rho, \quad C_0 = \sqrt{C_2/2C_4}. \quad (46)$$

Note that ρ and θ are related to x and y by $\rho = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ and $\tan\theta = y/x$. It turns out that even though the Lagrangian (43) has so many parameters, the dynamics essentially depends on two dimension-less variables, δ and λ defined by

$$\lambda = \sqrt{8C_4/e^2}, \quad \delta = \mu/eC_0. \quad (47)$$

The field equations which follow from here are

$$g''(r) - \frac{1}{r}g'(r) - gf^2 = \delta rh'(r) \quad (48)$$

$$h''(r) + \frac{1}{r}h'(r) - hf^2 = \frac{\delta}{r}g'(r) \quad (49)$$

$$f''(r) + \frac{1}{r}f'(r) - \frac{g^2f}{r^2} + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}f(1 - f^2) = -fh^2 \quad (50)$$

where $g'(r) \equiv dg(r)/dr$. The corresponding field energy can be shown to be

$$E_n = \pi C_0^2 \int_0^\infty r dr \left[\frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{dg}{dr} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{df}{dr} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dh}{dr} \right)^2 + h^2 f^2 + \frac{g^2 f^2}{r^2} + \frac{\lambda^2}{4} (1 - f^2)^2 \right] \quad (51)$$

Several remarks are in order at this stage.

1. As expected, in the limit $h = 0$ (i.e. $A_0 = 0$) and $\delta = 0$ (i.e. $\mu = 0$) the field equations reduce to those of the neutral vortex case. From the Gauss law Eq. (49) it also follows that if δ (i.e. μ) is non-zero, then A_0 *must* also be non-zero thereby justifying the *ansatz* (45).

2. The boundary conditions for finite energy solutions are

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) = 1, h(r) = 0 = g(r) \quad (52)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} f(r) = 0, g(r) = n, h(r) = \beta \quad (53)$$

where β is an arbitrary number while $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$

3. From these boundary conditions it immediately follows that the magnetic flux is quantized in units of $2\pi/e$ i.e.

$$\Phi \equiv \int B d^2x = -\frac{2\pi}{e} \int_0^\infty r dr \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{dg}{dr} \right) = \frac{2\pi n}{e}. \quad (54)$$

It may be noted that even for the neutral vortices, the flux is quantized in units of $\frac{2\pi}{e}$. The underlying reason for the flux quantization is same in both the cases i.e. both are topological objects with the underlying boundary conditions being such that there is a non-trivial mapping from the space time to the group manifold i.e. $\pi_1(U(1)) = Z$, with Z being the set of integers, forming a group under addition.

4. From the Gauss law Eq. (49), it then follows that these vortices also have a non-zero and finite Noether charge which is quantized in units of $2\pi\mu/e$. This is easily seen by noting that in terms of the electric and the magnetic fields, the Gauss law equation can be written as

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} + \mu B = \rho \quad (55)$$

where ρ is the Noether charge density. On integrating both sides of this equation, it then follows that

$$Q \equiv \int \rho d^2x = \mu \int B d^2x = \frac{2\pi\mu}{e} n. \quad (56)$$

Note that $\int \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} d^2x = 0$, since, because of the Higgs mechanism, both $\mathbf{E}$ and B fall off exponentially at long distances. This is probably for the first time that the quantization of the Noether charge has followed from purely topological considerations. In a sense, relation (56) can be looked upon as the (2+1)-analogue of the Witten effect [31]. Let us recall the work of Witten who had shown that in the presence of the

CP and T violating CP term, the t'Hooft-Polyakov monopole acquires electric charge whose fractional part is proportional to the coefficient of the CP term. It must however be remembered that whereas the Witten effect is purely a quantum mechanical effect, in our case, the vortices acquire a non-zero charge at the classical level itself due to the presence of the CS term.

5. It is also clear from here that in the Abelian Higgs model (without the CS term), one cannot have vortices having simultaneously the finite energy as well as the finite, non-zero Noether charge. The point is, in the absence of the CS term, the Gauss law Eq. (55) gives on integration

$$Q \equiv \int \rho d^2x = \int \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} d^2x. \quad (57)$$

The only way Q can be non-zero and finite is if there is a non-zero contribution to the integral around $r \rightarrow 0$ i.e. if $\mathbf{E} \rightarrow 1/r$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. But in that case, the electrical field energy $\int \mathbf{E}^2 d^2x$ diverges logarithmically [28].

6. The energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ for this model can be obtained by varying the curved space form of the action with respect to the metric

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu\phi)^*(D_\nu\phi) + \frac{1}{2}(D_\nu\phi)^*D_\mu\phi - g_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{L} - \frac{\mu}{4}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}F^{\alpha\beta}A^\gamma) \quad (58)$$

where the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ is as given by Eq. (43). Note that the CS term, being independent of the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$, does not contribute to the energy momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$. Using this $T_{\mu\nu}$ and the field equations, the angular momentum carried by the charged vortices can be shown to be

$$J \equiv \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} x_i T_{oj} = -\frac{nQ}{2e} = -\frac{\pi\mu}{e^2}n^2 = -\frac{Q\Phi}{4\pi}. \quad (59)$$

Thus, unlike the neutral vortices, the angular momentum of the charged vortices is non-zero and is solely determined by their charge and flux. Besides, the angular momentum of n superimposed charged vortices is n^2 and not n times the angular momentum of a single vortex. Further, since the CS mass μ is not quantized in the Abelian case, hence this angular momentum J can in general take any fractional value. This strongly suggests that these charged vortices are charged anyons.

Fröhlich and Marchetti [30] have in fact rigorously proved that these charged vortices are charged anyons. In particular, they constructed quantum one vortex operator and then evaluated the phase acquired when one such vortex is slowly taken round the other. They also show that the charged vortices cannot be localized in bounded regions but are localized in space-like cones in three-dimensional Minkowski space-time [32]. Unfortunately their treatment is rather involved and is beyond the scope of this pedagogical article. Thus the solitons of the Abelian Higgs model with the CS term provides us with a relativistic field theory model for the extended charged anyons.

7. The magnetic moment of these vortices can be computed by using the field equations and one can show that, whereas for the neutral vortices it is equal to the flux $\Phi(= 2\pi n/e)$, the charged ones acquire an extra contribution

$$K_z \equiv \int (\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J})_z d^2x = \frac{2\pi n}{e} + \frac{2\pi\delta}{e} \int_0^\infty rh(r)dr. \quad (60)$$

Unusual Higgs Mechanism

One must now solve the field Eqs. (48) to (50) and show the existence of the charged vortex solutions. To date, no analytic solution has been obtained of these field equations. However, it is easily seen that for large r , the asymptotic values of the gauge and the Higgs fields are reached exponentially fast

$$g(r) = \alpha_\pm \sqrt{r} e^{-\eta_\pm r} + \dots, \quad h(r) = \mp \frac{\alpha_\pm}{\sqrt{r}} e^{-\eta_\pm r} + \dots, \quad (61)$$

$$f(r) = 1 + \beta e^{-\lambda r} + \dots \quad (62)$$

where $\alpha_\pm$ and β are dimension-less constants while the dimension-less vector meson mass $\eta_\pm$ is given by

$$\eta_\pm = \sqrt{1 + \frac{\delta^2}{4}} \pm \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (63)$$

However, it has subsequently been shown that the solution with η_+ *does not* exist for all r .

On noting that the field Eqs. (48) to (50) are invariant under $r \rightarrow -r$, it is easily shown that the behavior of the gauge and the Higgs fields around $r = 0$ is given by

$$g(r) = n + \alpha_1 r^2 + O(r^4), \quad h(r) = \beta + \alpha_1 \delta \frac{r^2}{2} + O(r^4), \quad (64)$$

$$f(r) = \alpha_2 r^{|n|} + O(r^{|n|+2}). \quad (65)$$

Detailed numerical work has subsequently confirmed the existence of the radially symmetric charged vortex solutions with these boundary conditions [34]. These correspond to n superimposed vortices. The qualitative behaviour of the charged vortex solution which follows from here is as follows : the magnetic field B decreases monotonically from its non-zero value at the core of the vortex ($r = 0$) to reach zero as $r \rightarrow \infty$ with the penetration length $1/\eta_-$, while the Higgs field increases from zero at the origin to its vacuum value at infinity with coherence length $1/\lambda$. Finally, the electric field E_ρ which is radial, vanishes both at $r = 0$ and $r = \infty$ reaching the maximum in between at some finite r . It is worth pointing out that as in the quantum Hall effect, for the charged vortex solutions too, $\mathbf{E}(\equiv E_\rho)$ is at right angles to $\mathbf{J}(\equiv j_\theta)$ and both in turn are at right angles to $\mathbf{B}$.

Why did one obtain two asymptotic solutions for g and h , i.e. for the gauge fields A_θ and A_0 ? This is because of the unusual nature of the Higgs mechanism in $2 + 1$ dimensions in the presence of the CS term. Notice that in our case both the Maxwell and the CS terms are present and in addition there is also Higgs mechanism in operation. Clearly such a theory must still propagate only two massive modes. As has been shown in [35], in this case $\mathcal{L}_{quad}$ corresponds to Proca equation with the CS term. It propagates a self-dual field with two distinct CS type masses and that corresponding to each mass there is one (P and T violating) propagating mode. Further, the two masses (in dimension-less form) are precisely $\eta_\pm$ as given by Eq. (63) thereby explaining the reason for the occurrence of two asymptotic solutions $\eta_\pm$.

Vortex-Vortex Interaction

One of the most interesting question is whether these charged vortices can be observed experimentally in some planar system. In this context recall that the neutral (Abrikosov) vortices have been experimentally seen in type-II superconductors. This can be understood from the fact that whereas the vortex-vortex interaction is repulsive in the type-II region ($\lambda > 1$), it is

attractive in the type-*I* region of superconductivity. It is thus of great interest to study the charged vortex-vortex interaction and to see when is it repulsive. This has been done both in the perturbation theory (in the CS mass) and by the variational calculation [34], and in both cases one finds that the charged vortex-vortex interaction is more repulsive than the corresponding neutral case with the extra repulsion coming from the electric field of the charged vortex. For example, when the CS mass is small, then on expanding the charged n -vortex fields in terms of the corresponding neutral vortex fields it has been shown that

$$E_n(\lambda, \delta) - nE_1(\lambda, \delta) = E_n(\lambda, 0) - nE_1(\lambda, 0) + \frac{(n^2 - n)}{4}\delta^2 + O(\delta^4) \quad (66)$$

so that the charged vortex-vortex interaction is always more repulsive than the corresponding neutral case. For example, for $\delta = 0.5$, one finds that the charged vortex-vortex interaction is repulsive even for $\lambda > 0.45$ (note that in the neutral case the interaction is repulsive only if $\lambda > 1$).

Non-Abelian Charged Vortex Solutions

It is clearly of considerable interest to enquire whether the charged vortex solutions obtained above can be embedded in non-Abelian gauge theories with the CS term. The first obvious question is whether such vortices could be topologically stable or not. It is easily seen that if G is the gauge group of the non-Abelian gauge theory and H is the sub-group under which the vacuum remains invariant after spontaneous symmetry breaking, then topologically non-trivial vortices are possible only if

$$\pi_1(G/H) \neq 0. \quad (67)$$

In the case of $SU(N)$ gauge theories, it turns out that no Z -vortices are possible. However, Z_N -vortices are possible in case H is Z_N since $\pi_1(SU(N)/Z_N) = Z_N$. It turns out that at least N Higgs multiplets are required so that the vacuum is invariant under Z_N [36]. As a result, only one non-trivial charged vortex is possible in the case of $SU(2)$ gauge theory with flux $\Phi = 2\pi/g$, charge $Q = \mu\Phi = 2\pi\mu/g$, and angular momentum $J = -Q\Phi/4\pi = -\pi\mu/g^2$ where g is the gauge coupling constant. But since the CS mass μ is quantized in non-Abelian gauge theories having $SU(2)$ as its sub-group i.e.

$$\mu = \frac{g^2}{4\pi}n, \quad n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots \quad (68)$$

and hence the vortex charge is $gn/2$ i.e. it is quantized in units of $g/2$ while the angular momentum is quantized in units of $1/4$ i.e. $J = -n/4$. This is remarkable as it strongly suggests that if the usual spin-statistics connection is valid then whereas the Abelian charged vortex is an anyon with any phase factor, the non-Abelian ($SU(2)$) charged vortex can only be a semion, a fermion or a boson.

Relativistic Pure Chern-Simons Vortices

We have obtained above the charged vortex solutions in case the gauge part of the Abelian Higgs model consists of both the Maxwell and the CS term. It may be of some interest to enquire whether the Abelian Higgs model with pure CS term can also admit charged vortex solutions. This question is specially relevant in the context of condensed matter systems since in the long wave length limit, the CS term having one derivative dominates over the Maxwell term which has two derivatives. It turns out that the answer to the question is yes [37].

In the absence of the Maxwell term and with the same rotationally symmetric ansatz as in Eq. (45), it follows from Eqs. (48) and (49) that the gauge field equations are already of first order. However, Eq. (50), for the Higgs fields, is still a coupled second order equation. We now show that in case one replaces the standard double well ϕ^4 -type potential by the following ϕ^6 -type potential [38]

$$V(|\phi|) = \frac{e^4}{8\mu^2} |\phi|^2 (|\phi|^2 - C_0^2)^2 \quad (69)$$

then even the Higgs field satisfies a first order equation. It is worth pointing out here that whereas a Higgs potential of the type $\sum_i C_i |\phi|^i$ with $0 \leq i \leq 4$ is renormalizable in $3 + 1$ dimensions, $\sum_i C_i |\phi|^i$ with $0 \leq i \leq 6$ is renormalizable in $2 + 1$ dimensions.

When the Maxwell term is absent and the Higgs potential is as given by (69), the vortex energy (51) can be rewritten as

$$E_n = \pi C_0^2 \int_0^\infty r dr \left[(f' \mp \frac{1}{r} f g)^2 + f^2 [h \mp \frac{(1-f^2)}{2\delta}]^2 \mp \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} [(1-f^2)g] \right]. \quad (70)$$

This gives a rigorous lower bound on the energy in terms of the flux

$$E_n \geq \pm \pi C_0^2 [g(0) - g(\infty)] \equiv \pm \frac{1}{2} e C_0^2 \Phi \quad (71)$$

since the finite energy consideration requires that $f^2 g$ vanish at both the ends. This bound is saturated when the following self-dual first order equations are satisfied

$$f'(r) = \pm \frac{1}{r} f g \quad (72)$$

$$-\frac{1}{r} g'(r) = \frac{h f^2}{\delta} = \pm \frac{1}{2\delta^2} f^2 (1 - f^2). \quad (73)$$

It is easily checked that these first order equations are consistent with the second order field Eq. (50). One can in fact decouple these coupled first order equations and show that the Higgs field f must satisfy the following un-coupled second order equation

$$f''(r) + \frac{1}{r} f'(r) - \frac{f'^2(r)}{f} + \frac{1}{2\delta^2} f^3 (1 - f^2) = 0. \quad (74)$$

Several comments are in order at this stage.

1. These self-dual equations are similar to those of the Nielsen-Olesen (neutral) self-dual vortices (which are valid only if $\lambda = 1$).
2. Whereas the Lagrangian for the self-dual neutral vortex case (i.e. Lagrangian (43) with $\mu = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$) is the bosonic part of a $N = 1$ supersymmetric theory [40], the Lagrangian for the self-dual charged vortex case (i.e. the Lagrangian (43) with the Maxwell term being absent and the Higgs potential being as given by Eq. (69)) is the bosonic part of a $N = 2$ supersymmetric theory [41].
3. The ϕ^4 -potential as given in Eq. (43) and the ϕ^6 -potential as given by Eq. (69) represent very different physical situations. For example, whereas the ϕ^4 -potential corresponds to the case of the second order phase transition with $T < T_c^{II}$, the ϕ^6 -potential as given in Eq. (69) corresponds to the case of first order phase transition with $T = T_c^I$ [42].
4. The nature of Higgs mechanism when only Chern-Simons term is present is somewhat unusual [39]. One finds that in the limit $e^2 \rightarrow \infty$, $\mu \rightarrow \infty$, with their ratio fixed, the mass m_+ decouples from the theory. Thus in the case of the pure CS term, one finds that after the Higgs mechanism, the gauge field is massive and propagates one mode.

Let us now discuss the most remarkable property of the self-dual Eqs. (72) and (73). In particular, since the Higgs potential (69) has degenerate minima at $|\phi| = 0$ and $|\phi| = C_0$, hence, it turns out that at the self-dual point, one can simultaneously have both the topological and the non-topological charged vortex solutions. It is worth pointing out that at the time of this discovery, no other self-dual system was known which exhibited this remarkable property.

Topological Self-dual Solutions

The topological, self dual charged vortex solutions satisfy the same boundary conditions as given by Eqs. (52) and (53) with $\beta \equiv h(r=0) = \pm 1/2\delta^2$. Note that the upper (lower) sign corresponds to $n > 0 (< 0)$. As a result, the flux Φ , the Noether charge Q , and the angular momentum J of these charged vortices are again as given by Eqs. (54), (56) and (59) respectively while the energy of these charged vortices is $\pi C_0^2 |n|$. From now onwards, we shall confine our discussion to the case of $n > 0$ i.e. those corresponding to the upper choice of sign. Solution with $n < 0$ are related to these by the transformation $g \rightarrow -g$, $f \rightarrow f$.

A countable infinite number of sum rules have been derived [43] and using the first two, it has been proved that the magnetic moment of the topological, self-dual charged n -vortex is given by [44]

$$K_z = 2\pi n(n+1) \frac{\delta^2}{e}. \quad (75)$$

Note that for the neutral n -vortex, $K_z = \Phi = 2\pi n/e$.

No analytic topological self dual charged vortex solution has been obtained as yet. However, one can show that all the fields approach their asymptotic values exponentially fast. It may be noted that at the self-dual point, the vector and the scalar meson masses are equal. Further, whereas for the Maxwell-CS case, the magnetic field is maximum at the core of the vortex ($r \rightarrow 0$), for the pure CS vortices, the magnetic field is zero at the core of the vortex and is concentrated in a ring surrounding the vortex core.

Non-topological Self-dual Solutions

Since $|\phi| = 0$ as well as $|\phi| = C_0$ are degenerate minima of the Higgs potential (69), hence it turns out that one could also have non-topological self-dual charged vortex solutions [44, 45]. In this case, the finite energy considerations demand the following boundary conditions

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) = 0, \quad g(r) = \mp \alpha, \quad \alpha > 0 \quad (76)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} f(r) = 0, \quad g(r) = n \quad \text{for } n \neq 0 \quad (77)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} f(r) = \eta, \quad g(r) = 0 \quad \text{for } n = 0 \quad (78)$$

where η is an arbitrary number while $-\alpha(+\alpha)$ is for $n > 0(< 0)$. As a result, the flux, the charge, the energy and the angular momentum of these vortices for ($n > 0$) are

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \frac{2\pi}{e}(n + \alpha), \quad Q = \mu\Phi = \frac{2\pi\mu}{e}(n + \alpha), \\ J &= \frac{\pi\mu}{e^2}(\alpha^2 - n^2), \quad E = \pi C_0^2(n + \alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Note that unlike the topological case, the angular momentum is no more equal to $-Q\phi/4\pi$. Here α is a positive number but how much is it? The finiteness of energy requires that $\alpha > 1$ but otherwise α seems to be completely arbitrary. However, it is not so and we now show [46] that α satisfies a rigorous lower bound of $\alpha \geq n + 2$. To this end, consider the self-dual Eq. (73). On integrating both sides of this equation and using boundary conditions (76) to (78), one obtains (for $n > 0$)

$$-\int_0^\infty \frac{dg}{dr} dr = n + \alpha = \frac{1}{2\delta^2} \int_0^\infty r dr f^2(1 - f^2) > 0. \quad (80)$$

Similarly, on using Eqs. (72) and (73) we have on integration

$$\int_0^\infty g \frac{dg}{dr} dr = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - n^2) = -\frac{1}{2\delta^2} \int_0^\infty r^2 f(1 - f^2) \frac{df}{dr} dr. \quad (81)$$

On integrating by parts and using the fact that $r^2 f^2$ and $r^2 f^4$ vanish as $r \rightarrow \infty$ (note $f(r) \sim r^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha > 1$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$), we then have

$$(\alpha^2 - n^2) = \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_0^\infty r dr (f^2 - \frac{1}{2}f^4). \quad (82)$$

On combining the two sum rules, we then have

$$(\alpha + n)(\alpha - n - 2) = \frac{1}{2\delta^2} \int_0^\infty r dr f^4 \geq 0 \quad (83)$$

which gives us a rigorous lower bound on α i.e. $\alpha \geq n + 2$. It turns out that this bound is never saturated in the relativistic case. However, as we shall

see below, it is indeed saturated in the case of the non-relativistic self-dual non-topological charged vortices. It may be noted here that there is however no upper bound on α . We thus conclude that the flux of the relativistic non-topological vortices must necessarily be greater than $4\pi(n+1)/e$. More remarkable is the fact that whereas the angular momentum of the topological vortices is always negative and proportional to n^2 , the angular momentum of the non-topological vortices, on the other hand, is necessarily positive and in general is not proportional to n^2 . Further, the magnetic moment of the non-topological vortices has also been computed analytically by using the sum rules and shown to be negative [46]

$$K_z = -\frac{2\pi\delta^2}{e}(\alpha+n)(\alpha-n-1) < 0. \quad (84)$$

Note that the magnetic moment of the topological vortices is on the other hand always positive.

Are these non-topological vortices stable or do they decay to the charged scalar meson ? This question has been discussed [47] and it has been shown that as far as the decay to the scalar meson is concerned, these non-topological solitons are at the edge of their stability. In particular, using E and Q as given by Eq. (79) and noting that the mass m of the scalar particle in the symmetric vacuum is $e^2 c_0^2/2\mu$, it follows that $E = mQ/e$. Thus the stability does not impose any upper bound on the charge of the non-topological soliton. No analytic solutions of Eqs. (72) and (73) have been obtained as yet in the non-topological self-dual case. However, the behavior of the fields near $r \rightarrow 0$ and for large r is easily obtained. In particular, using the boundary conditions (76) to (78), it is not difficult to show that for $r \rightarrow \infty$, the $n = 0$ vortex solution has the behavior

$$g(r) = -\alpha + \frac{G_0^2}{4(\alpha-1)(r/\delta)^{2\alpha-2}} + O((r/\delta)^{-4\alpha+4}) \quad (85)$$

$$f(r) = \frac{G_0}{(r/\delta)^\alpha} - \frac{G_0^3}{8(\alpha-1)^2(r/\delta)^{3\alpha-2}} + O((r/\delta)^{-5\alpha+4}). \quad (86)$$

On the other hand, as $r \rightarrow 0$, while $f(0)$ is not constrained, $g(0)$ must vanish so as to have a non-singular solution. Thus for the $n = 0$ non-topological vortex, the magnetic field $(-g'(r)/r)$ is maximum at the core of the vortex ($r = 0$) and falls off with a power law fall off as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Note, however,

that the magnetic field for the topological CS vortices is zero at the core, and is maximum in a ring surrounding the core of the vortex.

Finally, let us consider the behavior of the $n \neq 0$ (we as usual consider $n > 0$) non-topological self-dual charged vortex solutions. It is easily shown that these solutions are hybrids of the two previous cases i.e. their large distance behavior is the same as those of the $n = 0$ non-topological charged vortex solutions as given by Eqs. (85) and (86). On the other hand their short distance behavior is the same as those of the self-dual topological charged vortex solutions. Thus for $n \neq 0$ non-topological vortices, the magnetic field vanishes at the core of the vortex and falls off with a power law fall off as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

It is worth pointing out that since the ϕ^6 -potential as given by Eq. (69) has two disconnected but degenerate vacua at $|\phi| = 0$ and $|\phi| = C_0$, hence, apart from the charged vortex solutions, they also possess one dimensional domain wall solutions [45, 42].

So far, we have only discussed the self-dual rotationally symmetric CS vortices. However, the self-dual solutions can in fact be obtained even without choosing the rotationally symmetric n -vortex *ansatz* (45). Further, rigorous arguments have subsequently been given for the existence of the self-dual topological [48] and non-topological [49] charged vortex solutions even when the vortices are not superimposed on each other but lie at arbitrary positions in the plane. Let us note an interesting fact about the angular momentum of these charged vortices. For example, whereas the angular momentum of the n superimposed topological vortices is n^2 times that of a single vortex, the angular momentum of the n topological vortices (each of which has unit vorticity) which are well separated from each other, is only n times the angular momentum of the single vortex. However, the energy, flux and the charge of the n vortices in both the cases is the *same*. Thus we see that whereas the energy, flux and charge, are the global quantities, the angular momentum of a configuration depends on the local behavior.

A zero-mode analysis of the spectrum of small fluctuations [45] around the self-dual vortices indicates that whereas the number of zero modes in the case of the topological self-dual vortices is $2n$, in the non-topological case, the same number is $2n + 2[\alpha]$ where $[\alpha]$ denotes the integer part of α . In the topological case, this number is identified with the number of parameters required to describe the location of the n vortices while the counting is less clear in the non-topological case.

Interaction Between Self-Dual CS Vortices

The slow motion of the Abelian self-dual CS vortices has been analyzed [50] using Manton's technique [51]. In this approach, one constructs an effective quantum mechanical Lagrangian (not density) which describes the fluctuations about the static self-dual classical configurations and not surprisingly, one obtains a statistical interaction term. Further one also obtains a term corresponding to the velocity dependent Magnus force. It turns out that this force is in fact necessary in order to have correct spin-statistics relation.

Self-dual charged vortices have also been obtained in the original ϕ^4 -type model itself by adding a neutral scalar field to Eq. (43) and changing the ϕ^4 -potential suitably [53].

Finally, semi-local self-dual CS vortices have been obtained in an Abelian Higgs model with pure CS term [52] and with $SU(N)_{global} \otimes U(1)_{local}$ symmetry. The interesting point is that the semi-local vortices, even though topologically trivial, are stable under small perturbations due to the gradient energy term.

Non-relativistic Chern-Simons Vortices

Let us now discuss the non-relativistic limit of the Abelian Higgs model with the pure CS term. The Lagrangian density for the Abelian Higgs model with pure CS term is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu \phi)^*(D^\mu \phi) + \frac{\mu}{4}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}F^{\mu\nu}A^\lambda - \frac{e^4}{8c^4\mu^2}|\phi|^2(|\phi|^2 - C_0^2)^2, \quad (87)$$

where the Higgs potential is as given by Eq. (69). Here we write all the factors of the velocity of light c explicitly since we are considering the non-relativistic limit of a relativistic theory. Let us first note that the quadratic term in the Higgs potential defines the mass through its coefficient $m^2c^2/2$. Comparison with Eq. (87) shows that C_0^2 must have the value $C_0^2 = (2|\mu|mc^3)/e^2$ so that the Lagrangian density (87) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2c^2}|\left(\partial_t - \frac{ie}{\hbar}A^0\right)\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{D}\phi|^2 - \frac{m^2c^2}{2}|\phi|^2 \\ &+ \frac{me^2}{2c|\mu|}|\phi|^4 - \frac{e^4}{8c^4\mu^2}|\phi|^6 + \frac{\mu}{4}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}F^{\mu\nu}A^\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

The non-relativistic limit ($c \rightarrow \infty$) now proceeds in the standard manner.

On writing the mode expansion of the scalar field ϕ as

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left[e^{-imc^2 t} \psi + e^{imc^2 t} \bar{\psi}^* \right] \quad (89)$$

and substituting it in Eq. (88), dropping all terms that either oscillate as $c \rightarrow \infty$ or are sub-leading in powers of c , the matter part of the Lagrangian density can be shown to be

$$\mathcal{L} = i\psi^* D_0 \psi - \frac{1}{2m} |\mathbf{D}\psi|^2 + \frac{e^2}{2mc|\mu|} \rho^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} F^{\mu\nu} A^\lambda. \quad (90)$$

Here $\rho = \psi^* \psi$ is the matter density of particles and we have dropped the anti-particle part from the Lagrangian density (i.e. we are working in the zero anti-particle sector) by setting $\bar{\psi} = 0$ since the particle and the anti-particle parts are separately conserved. The remarkable fact is that one now has an *attractive* quartic (ρ^2) self-interaction. This non-relativistic model can be looked upon either as a non-relativistic classical field theory or as a second quantized N -body problem with 2-body attractive delta-function interaction.

The Euler-Lagrangian equations of motion which follow from the Lagrangian density (90) are

$$-\frac{1}{2m} \mathbf{D}^2 \psi - \frac{e^2}{mc|\mu|} |\psi|^2 \psi - iD_0 \psi = 0 \quad (91)$$

$$F_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{\mu} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} J^\rho \quad (92)$$

where $J^\mu \equiv (\rho, \vec{J})$ is a Lorentz covariant notation for the conserved non-relativistic charge and current densities i.e.

$$\rho = |\psi|^2, \quad J^k = -\frac{i\hbar^2}{2m} [\psi^* D^k \psi - (D^k \psi)^* \psi]. \quad (93)$$

The field Eqs. (91) and (92) are together termed as the *planar gauged nonlinear Schrödinger equations*. The gauge field Eq. (92) can also be re-expressed as

$$B \equiv F_{12} = \frac{e}{\mu} \rho \quad (94)$$

$$E^i \equiv F_{i0} = -\frac{e}{c\mu} \varepsilon^{ik} J_k . \quad (95)$$

From here, we immediately obtain the fundamental relation between the Noether charge Q and the magnetic flux Φ i.e. $Q = \mu\Phi$. As in the relativistic case, it is easily checked that the second order field Eqs. (91) and (92) are solved by Eq. (94) and the self-dual ansatz

$$D_j \psi = \pm i \varepsilon_{jk} D_k \psi \quad (96)$$

in the case of the static solutions with A_0 chosen as

$$A_0 = \mp \frac{e}{2m\mu c} |\psi|^2 . \quad (97)$$

Here we have made use of the following factorization identity

$$\mathbf{D}^2 \psi = D_{\pm} D_{\mp} \psi \mp \frac{e}{c} F_{12} \psi . \quad (98)$$

We now show that the self-dual Eqs. (94) and (96) can be solved completely and explicitly. On writing the complex field ψ as $\psi = e^{-i\omega} \rho^{1/2}$ the self-duality Eq. (96) yields the vector potential

$$A_i = \partial_i \omega \pm \frac{c}{2e} \varepsilon^{ij} \partial_j \ln \rho \quad (99)$$

which is valid away from the zeros of ρ . On inserting this form of $\mathbf{A}$ into the other self-dual Eq. (94) yields the famous Liouville equation

$$\nabla^2 \ln \rho = -\frac{2e^2}{c|\mu|} \rho \quad (100)$$

which is known to be integrable and completely solvable and which must be solved away from the zeros of ρ . It is worth noting that with our sign conventions, we have the Liouville equation with the correct sign in that only such an equation has real, positive, regular solutions. The most general such solution is known to be given by

$$\rho = \frac{c|\mu| |f'(z)|^2}{e^2 [1 + |f(z)|^2]} \quad (101)$$

where $f(z)$ is any holomorphic function and $z = re^{i\theta}$. Explicit radially symmetric solutions may be obtained by taking $f(z) = (z/z_0)^{\pm n}$. The corresponding self-dual charge density is

$$\rho = \frac{4 |\mu| n^2 c}{e^2 r_0^2} \frac{(r/r_0)^{2(n-1)}}{[1 + (r/r_0)^{2n}]^2} \quad (102)$$

which behaves like $r^{2(n-1)}$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ while as $r \rightarrow \infty$, it behaves like r^{-2-2n} . Thus ρ is regular at the origin if $n \geq 1$. From Eq. (99) it then follows that as $r \rightarrow 0$, the vector potential behaves as

$$A_i(r) \sim \partial_i \omega \pm \frac{c(n-1)}{e} \varepsilon_{ij} \frac{x^j}{r^2} \quad (103)$$

i.e. it is singular at $r = 0$. This singularity is removed if we choose $\omega = \pm c(n-1)\theta/e$. Thus the profile of the self-dual ψ field is given by

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{2n\sqrt{|\mu|c}}{er_0} \frac{(r/r_0)^{n-1}}{[1 + (r/r_0)^{2n}]} e^{\pm i(n-1)\theta}. \quad (104)$$

On requiring that ψ be single valued, we then find that n must be an integer, and for ρ to have decaying behavior as $r \rightarrow \infty$, we require that n must be positive.

Several comments are in order at this stage.

1. Integrating ρ as given in (102) over all space yields n (the total number of particles) and hence the flux (in view of Eq. (94)). We obtain $\Phi = (4\pi cn/e)$ with $n = 1, 2, \dots$ which means that this configuration carries an even number of flux units. This is in contrast to the relativistic case where the flux unit need not necessarily be even. Further, note that unlike the relativistic non-topological case, here the lower bound on $\alpha (\geq n+2)$ is saturated. As has been shown [55], this is because of the special inversion symmetry of the Liouville equation. In particular, notice that the Liouville equation is invariant under the transformations

$$r \rightarrow 1/r, \quad \theta \rightarrow \theta, \quad \rho(r) \rightarrow \rho(1/r) = r^4 \rho(r). \quad (105)$$

As a result, the behavior of ρ at infinity is uniquely determined by its behavior at the origin thereby fixing $\alpha = n+2$.

2. It is worth pointing out the Q, Φ and J for the non-relativistic charged vortices are the same as those for the relativistic non-topological charged vortices as given by Eq. (79) provided one chooses $\alpha = n + 2$ (note that in the non-relativistic case, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ while $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ in the relativistic case).
3. The radially symmetric solution (104) was obtained by choosing the holomorphic function $f(z) \propto (z)^{-n}$ and corresponds to n solitons superimposed at the origin with common scale factor r_0 . The most general solution corresponding to n separated solitons may be obtained by taking

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{(z - z_i)} \quad (106)$$

where $2n$ real parameters z_i describe the location of the solitons and $2n$ real parameters α_i correspond to the scales and the phases of the solitons. Thus the solution depends on $4n$ parameters. Using an index theory calculation [56] it has been shown that this is the most general solution.

5 CP^1 Solitons With Hopf Term

In this section we discuss the extended (neutral) anyon solutions in relativistic field theories. Historically, such solutions were first written down in the case of $O(3)$ σ -model with Hopf term in 2+1 dimensions [57]. Unfortunately, in this case, the Hopf term cannot be written down as a local function of the basic fields of the theory. Therefore, we shall discuss the essentially equivalent example of the CP^1 model with the Hopf term since in this case the Hopf term can be written down as a local function of the basic fields of the theory [58].

The action for the CP^1 model in 2+1 dimensions is given by

$$I = \int d^3x (D_\mu z)^*(D^\mu z) \quad (107)$$

where $D_\mu z \equiv (\partial_\mu - iA_\mu)z$ with $z = (z_1, z_2)$ being a complex vector fulfilling $|z|^2 = 1$. Note that A_μ here does not represent independent degrees of

freedom, but is entirely determined in terms of $z(x)$ through the constraint equation

$$A_\mu = -iz^* \partial_\mu z. \quad (108)$$

The action (107) is invariant under the local $U(1)$ transformations

$$z_a(x) \rightarrow z_a(x)e^{i\Lambda(x)}, \quad A_\mu(x) \rightarrow A_\mu(x) + \partial_\mu \Lambda(x). \quad (109)$$

As is well known, the CP^1 model admits self-dual soliton solutions. To obtain them, let us first note that the field equation is obtained by extremizing the action (107) with respect to $z(x)$ subject to the constraint $|z|^2 = 1$. This constraint is best introduced in the variational formalism by using a Lagrangian multiplier i.e. one extremizes $I + \int d^3x \lambda(x)(z^*z - 1)$. The resulting field equation is

$$(D_\mu D^\mu + \lambda)z = 0. \quad (110)$$

The Lagrange multiplier $\lambda(x)$ is eliminated by using $\lambda = \lambda z^*z = -z^* D_\mu D^\mu z$. Let us now consider the static solutions. In this case, the field equation (110) reduces to

$$\nabla^2 z - (z^* \cdot \nabla^2 z)z = 0. \quad (111)$$

The energy of a static solution as obtained from the action (107) is clearly

$$E = \int (D_i z)^* (D_i z) d^2x, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (112)$$

Finiteness of energy requires that as $r \equiv |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow \infty$, $D_i z \equiv \partial_i z - iA_i z = 0$.

Let us start from the topological inequality which follows from

$$\left[(D_i z)^* \pm i\varepsilon_{ij} (D_j z)^* \right] \cdot \left[D_i z \mp i\varepsilon_{ik} D_k z \right] \geq 0. \quad (113)$$

Because of the constraint $|z|^2 = 1$, this inequality can be re-expressed in the form

$$(D_i z)^* \cdot (D_i z) \geq \varepsilon_{ij} (D_i z)^* \cdot (D_j z) \quad (114)$$

so that the energy is bounded from below by the topological charge Q i.e. $E \geq 2\pi |Q|$, where

$$Q = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int d^2x \varepsilon_{ij} (D_i z)^* \cdot (D_j z). \quad (115)$$

In any Q -sector, the energy reaches its minimum when the fields minimize the energy in that sector and satisfy the first order self dual field equation

$$D_i z = \pm i \varepsilon_{ij} D_j z. \quad (116)$$

Note that the solutions of Eq. (116) automatically solve the second order field Eq. (111) while the converse need not be true.

The most general solution for z can be written down in terms of (anti) holomorphic function ω

$$z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\omega|^2}} \begin{pmatrix} \omega \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (117)$$

These solutions are characterized by the energy $E = 2\pi |Q|$ where Q is as given by Eq. (115). One can in fact define a topological current J^μ

$$J^\mu = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} (D_\nu z)^* (D_\lambda z) \quad (118)$$

which is conserved by construction, and the topological charge Q as given above, is related to it by $Q = \int J^0 d^2x$. One can easily show that for the soliton solutions, Q is just the winding number i.e. Q clearly describes the homotopy of the mapping $\mathbf{S}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_2$.

Since J^μ is the topological conserved current, hence one can clearly add the following gauge invariant action

$$I_H = \int d^3x \frac{\theta}{2\pi} A_\mu J^\mu \quad (119)$$

to the original action (107). This action is nothing but the Hopf term which is related formally to the CS term since from Eqs. (108) and (118) it follows that

$$A_\mu J^\mu = \frac{1}{4\pi} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} A_\mu F_{\nu\lambda}. \quad (120)$$

Note however that here A_μ is not an independent gauge field but is entirely determined in terms of $z(x)$ through the constraint Eq. (108). As a result, unlike the CS term, the Hopf term is locally a total divergence and hence does not contribute to the equations of motion.

Note that unlike the CS term, the Hopf term has no dynamics. Besides, for the CP^1 soliton solutions (which are time independent solutions of the

equations of motion), the Hopf term is identically zero because of the time derivative and the relationship (108). Thus the way the Hopf term imparts fractional spin and statistics to the soliton is similar to that in quantum mechanics but it is very different than the way the CS term imparts fractional spin and statistics. In particular, since the Hopf density is a total divergence, hence the Hopf action can be expressed in terms of the surface terms, namely two integrals at the initial and final times so that in the path integral formalism, the contribution of this action is essentially in terms of the phases of the initial and the final wave functions. Since the configuration space in question is multi-connected, the Hopf action depends on the homotopy classes of the path and, therefore, the converted phases are multi-valued which in turn gives rise to the fractional spin ($= \theta/2\pi$) and the solitons obey fractional statistics characterized by θ [57, 58].

6 Anyons as Elementary field Quanta

In this section we enquire whether one can construct local quantum field theories where the fundamental fields represent the creation and annihilation of anyons. Let us consider a complex bosonic non-relativistic matter field $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ of mass m (of course a similar discussion can also be done for the fermionic matter field). Let us minimally couple it to an Abelian gauge field A_μ with a CS kinetic term [5, 59]

$$S = \int d^3x [i\psi^\dagger D_0\psi + \frac{1}{2m}\psi^\dagger(D_1^2 + D_2^2)\psi + \frac{\mu}{2}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}A_\mu\partial_\nu A_\lambda] \quad (121)$$

where $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu$ is the covariant derivative. For simplicity, in this section we shall set $\hbar = c = 1$. On varying the action with respect to A_μ , we obtain

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}F_{\nu\lambda} = \frac{2e}{\mu}J^\mu \quad (122)$$

where the current J^μ is explicitly given by

$$\rho \equiv J^0 = \psi^\dagger\psi, \quad J^k = \frac{1}{2mi}[\psi^\dagger D^k\psi - (D^k\psi)^\dagger\psi]. \quad (123)$$

Here ρ and $\mathbf{J}$ are the number density and the current density operators respectively which satisfy the continuity equation $\partial_t\rho + \nabla\cdot\mathbf{J} = 0$. As seen in

previous sections, Eq. (122) is a remarkable relation indicating that the CS field strength is completely determined by the particle current. Even more remarkable is the fact that the gauge potential A_μ itself is not an independent degree of freedom.

Let us consider the $\mu = 0$ component of Eq. (122)

$$B = \frac{e}{\mu} \rho \quad (124)$$

where $B = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ is the CS magnetic field. This equation is clearly the second quantized version of the Gauss law constraint obtained in the last two chapters (except that whereas in those cases ρ was the charge density, here ρ is the matter density, hence the extra factor of e in Eq. (124) compared to those cases). Now, in the weyl gauge $\partial_i A^i = 0$. Hence, one can invert Eq. (124) without any ambiguity and solve for the vector potential $\mathbf{A}$. We obtain

$$A^i(x) = \varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \left(\frac{e}{\mu} \int d^2 y G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \rho(y) \right) \quad (125)$$

where G is the two-dimensional Green function

$$\nabla^2 G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad (126)$$

whose solution is well known to be

$$G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln(p \mid \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \mid) \quad (127)$$

where p is an arbitrary scale. Thus A^i can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} A^i(x) &= \varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \left[\frac{e}{2\pi\mu} \int d^2 y \ln \mid \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \mid \rho(y) \right] \\ &= -\frac{e}{2\pi\mu} \int d^2 y \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \rho(y) \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

where ϕ is the winding (polar) angle i.e.

$$\phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \arctan\left(\frac{x^2 - y^2}{x^1 - y^1}\right). \quad (129)$$

Note that while writing the second line of Eq. (128), we have used the Cauchy-Riemann equations

$$\varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \ln \mid \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \mid = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \quad (130)$$

It is worth pointing out that $\varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ is ill-defined at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$. Thus one has to supplement Eqs. (126) and (127) with a regularization prescription. One such prescription is

$$\varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} G(\mathbf{x}) \longrightarrow \varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} G^a(\mathbf{x}) \quad (131)$$

where the regulated Green function $G^{(a)}(\mathbf{x})$ is

$$G^{(a)}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{a\pi} \int d^2y \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \right) e^{-y^2/a}. \quad (132)$$

This has the desired property that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} G^{(a)}(\mathbf{x}) = G(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln |\mathbf{x}| \quad (133)$$

while for any a

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} G^{(a)}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad (134)$$

so that once Eq. (132) is systematically used, all ambiguities are eliminated.

If one is now allowed to move the derivative operator outside the integral (128), then one could express $\mathbf{A}$ as a gradient. However, $\phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ is a multi-valued function. Hence one must first fix a branch-cut in the y -plane starting at x so as to make it single-valued. No matter what choice is made for this cut, the resulting range of integration of $\mathbf{y}$ will depend on $\mathbf{x}$ and hence extra contributions are produced in moving $\partial/\partial x^i$ outside the $\mathbf{y}$ integral. Thus, in general one can not write

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{e}{2\pi\mu} \nabla_x \left[\int d^2y \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \rho(y) \right]. \quad (135)$$

so that in general $\mathbf{A}$ is not a pure gauge and hence it cannot be removed by a gauge transformation. However, in the special case when $\rho(y)$ is a sum of δ -functions, $\mathbf{A}(x)$ is indeed a pure gauge. Such a situation arises in the case of non-relativistic localized point particles [59]. Let us assume that in the context of our non-relativistic model (121) too, $\rho(y)$ is a sum of δ -functions in which case the CS gauge field A_μ is entirely determined by the matter configuration i.e. ρ and $\mathbf{J}$.

Thus, in the case of localized densities, $A_\mu(x) = -\partial_\mu \Lambda(x)$ i.e. the CS field is a pure gauge and hence it can be removed by the gauge transformation

$A_\mu \longrightarrow A'_\mu = A_\mu + \partial_\mu \Lambda = 0$. Thus, under such a singular transformation, covariant derivatives turn into ordinary derivatives, and the action (121) becomes

$$S' = \int d^3x \left[i\tilde{\psi}^+ \partial_0 \tilde{\psi} + \frac{1}{2m} \tilde{\psi}^+ (\partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2) \tilde{\psi} \right] \quad (136)$$

where the new matter field $\tilde{\psi}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\psi}(x) = e^{-ie\Lambda(x)} \psi(x), \quad \tilde{\psi}^+(x) = \psi^+(x) e^{ie\Lambda(x)}. \quad (137)$$

The above action (136) is that of a free, complex, non-relativistic, scalar field $\tilde{\psi}$. However, we now show that such a field *does not* obey the conventional commutation relations as satisfied by ψ .

We can quantize the action (121) by imposing the equal-time commutation relations for the bosonic field ψ

$$[\psi(\mathbf{x}, t), \psi^+(\mathbf{y}, t)] = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad (138)$$

$$[\psi(\mathbf{x}, t), \psi(\mathbf{y}, t)] = 0 = [\psi^+(\mathbf{x}, t), \psi^+(\mathbf{y}, t)]. \quad (139)$$

Since the gauge field $\mathbf{A}$ is a function of the number density operator $\rho (= \psi^+ \psi)$, hence the commutator of $\mathbf{A}$ and ψ is not trivial. In fact using Eqs. (128) and (138) we obtain

$$[A^i(\mathbf{x}, t), \psi(\mathbf{y}, t)] = -\frac{e}{\mu} \varepsilon^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \psi(\mathbf{y}). \quad (140)$$

On using the regularized Green function as given by Eq. (132), it then follows by using Eq. (134) that $[A^i(\mathbf{x}, t), \psi(\mathbf{x}, t)] = 0$. This is interesting because it means that there are no ordering ambiguities in the quantum theory as given by Eq. (121).

One can now show that when ψ obeys ordinary commutation relations, $\tilde{\psi}$ obeys

$$\tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{x}, t) \tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, t) = e^{i\pi\alpha} \tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, t) \tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad (141)$$

i.e. the matter field $\tilde{\psi}$ obeys anyonic commutation relations of statistics $\alpha (= e^2/2\pi\mu)$. If instead, we make a cut along the negative x' -axis, then we would obtain a phase factor ($e^{-i\pi\alpha}$), opposite to that in Eq. (141). Proceeding in the same way, it is easily shown that if $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ then

$$\tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{x}, t) \tilde{\psi}^+(\mathbf{y}, t) = e^{-i\pi\alpha} \tilde{\psi}^+(\mathbf{y}, t) \tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (142)$$

It must however be noted that for $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$, the phase proportional to α vanishes and hence the canonical commutation relations remain unchanged.

Some clarification is called for at this stage. What one has shown is that the fields $\tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $\tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, t)$ satisfy anyonic commutation relations with the phase factor $e^{+i\pi\alpha}$ or $e^{-i\pi\alpha}$ depending on how we make the cut. However, this is not enough. What is really required is that the phase of the wave function changes both by $+\pi\alpha$ and $-\pi\alpha$ in response to which way we braid in interchanging $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$. No one has been able to show this so far. In fact, what we have shown above is the best that one can achieve with local operators $\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\psi}^+$. Local information, like initial and final positions of particles, is simply not sufficient to code the braiding, where we also have to specify which way the particles passed around each other in interchanging their positions. As I see it, the only way to take care of this problem in this formalism is to choose such a definition of the multi-valued function ϕ which will make $\tilde{\psi}$ a non-local operator.

Summarizing, it appears that within the non-relativistic field theory formalism, anyons can only be described by non-local operators, which are hard to deal with. If one insists on a local formulation, then one has to hide the statistics in an interaction with a CS field.

There is no doubt that ideally the various effects of fractional spin, such as the spin-statistics theorem should be understood only in a full fledged relativistic quantum field theory. However, relatively little is known in this respect. The point is, if the fundamental fields are to carry fractional spin, they must carry a multi-valued irreducible representation of $SO(2, 1)$. This is because, a rotation of 2π does not leave the Wave function invariant, but rather, it multiplies it by a phase $e^{2i\pi j}$. We then have the following two options.

The first option is that we define infinite component fields and from them construct one particle dynamics by imposing equations of motion that satisfy the requirement that one-particle states provide multi-valued Poincaré equations. The most difficult part is the derivation of an action that reproduces these equations of motion. This requires handling a nonlocal theory and no one really knows how to quantize such a theory.

The second option is to work with multi-valued fields by adding the CS term to the action and essentially repeat what we have done above for the non-relativistic case. Thus, instead of the non-relativistic model (121), one could consider a relativistic field theory, say a complex scalar field theory,

coupled to an Abelian gauge field with a CS kinetic energy term (and no Maxwell term). Coming back to complex fields, one again wants to know if one can construct local quantum field theory where the fundamental fields represent the creation and annihilation of anyons. On proceeding exactly as in the nonrelativistic case, one again obtains Eq. (124). However, now the particles are not point particles but are extended objects, hence $\rho(y)$ cannot be a sum of delta functions. Thus it is not possible to write $\mathbf{A}$ as a pure gauge and hence it cannot be removed by a gauge transformation. Thus, it is not at all clear whether in the relativistic case the only effect of the gauge field is to endow the particle with arbitrary spin or if residual interactions are also present. A similar problem also arises in models which emerge from the relativistic theory in the non-relativistic limit. In particular, one obtains different results depending on which limit is taken first i.e. the size of the extended object going to zero vis-a-vis the regulator parameter going to zero. Attempts have been made to tackle these problems by quantizing the theory with CS term on a lattice with or without the Maxwell term. So far, these attempts have met with only a limited success.

Thus it is fair to say that, so far we do not have a model in relativistic local quantum field theory where the fundamental (non-interacting) field quanta are themselves anyons. In fact it appears unlikely that one can obtain a simple, local (relativistic) Lagrangian for anyons. This is because, even in $2+1$ dimensions, spin has to be an integer or half-integer for local fields. On the other hand, fractional spin is admissible for fields which carry charges associated with gauge symmetries (with accompanying flux integrals at infinity) which are typically localizable only in space-like cones [32, 30]. This is what happens for example, when one generates fractional spin by coupling point particles to a CS gauge field which has non-trivial long-ranged properties.

References

- [1] E.A. Abbot, *Flatland* (Princeton Univ. Press, New Edition, 1991).
- [2] C.H. Hinton, *An Episode Of Flatland* (1907).
- [3] M. Gardner, in *The Unexpected Hanging And Other Mathematical Diversions*, ed. M. Gardner (Simon and Schuster 1969).

- [4] A.K. Dewdney, *Two Dimensional Science and Technology, J. Recreate. Math.* **12** (1979) 16 ; For a short summary of the book see M. Gardner, *Sci. Ame.*, *July Issue* (1980) 18.
- [5] For the details see for example, A. Khare, *Fractional Statistics and Quantum Theory* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997).
- [6] R.B. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983) 1395.
- [7] For a popular readable account see A. Khurana, *Phys. Today* **43(1)** (1990) 19.
- [8] J.M. Leinaas and J. Myrheim, *Nuovo Cim.* **B37** (1977) 1.
- [9] R. Mirman, *Nuovo Cim.* **B18** (1973) 110.
- [10] F. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** (1991) 937.
- [11] For a detailed review of various properties see for example, A. Khare, *Fort. der. Physik* **38** (1990) 507 ; *Proc. Indian Natn. Sc. Acad.* **A61** (1995) 161.
- [12] W. Siegel, *Nucl. Phys.* **B156** (1979) 135; J. Schonfeld, *Nucl. Phys.* **B185** (1981) 157; R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, *Phys. Rev.* **D23** (1981) 2291; C.R. Hagen, *Ann. Phys.N.Y.* **157** (1984) 342.
- [13] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48** (1982) 975; *Ann. of Phys.* **140** (1982) 372.
- [14] S. Coleman and B. Hill, *Phys. Lett.* **B159** (1985) 184.
- [15] A. Khare, R.B. MacKenzie and M.B. Paranjape, *Phys. Lett.* **B343** (1995) 239.
- [16] C. R. Hagen, P.K. Panigrahi and S. Ramaswami, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** (1988) 389.
- [17] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media, Second Edition* (Pergamon Press, Oxford 1963).
- [18] T.H. O'Dell, *The Electrodynamics of Magneto-Electric Media* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970).

- [19] A. Khare and T. Pradhan, *Phys. Lett.* **B231** (1989) 178.
- [20] S.K. Paul and A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.* **B193** (1987) 253, **B196** (1987) E571.
- [21] R.D. Pisarski and S. Rao, *Phys. Rev.* **D32** (1985) 2081.
- [22] G. Giavarini, C.P. Martin and F. Ruiz Ruiz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B381** (1992) 222.
- [23] A. Khare, R.B. MacKenzie, P.K. Panigrahi and M.B. Paranjape, *Phys. Lett.* **B355** (1995) 236; L. Chen, G. Dunne, K. Haller and E. Lim-Lombridas, *Phys. Lett.* **B348** (1995) 468.
- [24] A.N. Redlich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52** (1984) 18 ; *Phys. Rev.* **D29** (1984) 2366; A. J. Niemi and G.W. Semenoff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51** (1983) 2077.
- [25] A.S. Schwarz, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **2** (1978) 247; E. Witten, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **121** (1989) 351.
- [26] A.A. Abrikosov, *Sovt. Phys. JETP* **5** (1957) 1174.
- [27] H.B. Nielsen and P. Olesen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B61** (1973) 45.
- [28] B. Julia and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev.* **D11** (1975) 2227.
- [29] S.K. Paul and A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.* **B174** (1986) 420; **B177** (1986) E453.
- [30] J. Fröhlich and P.A. Marchetti, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **121** (1989) 177.
- [31] E. Witten, *Phys. Lett.* **B86** (1979) 283.
- [32] D. Buchholz and K. Fredenhagen, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **84** (1982) 1.
- [33]
- [34] L. Jacobs, A. Khare, C.N. Kumar and S.K. Paul, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A6** (1991) 3441.
- [35] S.K. Paul and A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.* **B171** (1986) 244.

- [36] H.J. de Vega and F.A. Schaposnik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56** (1986) 2564 ;
Phys. Rev. **D34** (1986) 3206; C.N. Kumar and A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.*
B178 (1986) 395, **B182** (1986) E415; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59** (1987) 377 ;
Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 3253.
- [37] D.P. Jatkar and A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.* **B236** (1990) 283.
- [38] J. Hong, Y. Kim and P.Y. Pac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 2230; R.
Jackiw and E.J. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 2234.
- [39] S. Deser and Z. Yang, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A4** (1989) 2123.
- [40] P. di Vecchia and S. Ferrara, *Nucl. Phys.* **B130** (1977) 93.
- [41] C. Lee, K. Lee and E.J. Weinberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B243** (1990) 105.
- [42] S.N. Behera and A. Khare, *Pramana (J. Phys., India)* **15** (1980) 245.
- [43] A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.* **B277** (1992) 123.
- [44] A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.* **B255** (1991) 393.
- [45] R. Jackiw, K. Lee and E.J. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 3488.
- [46] A. Khare, *Phys. Lett.* **B263** (1991) 227.
- [47] D.P. Jatkar and A. Khare, *J. Phys.* **A24** (1991) L1201; D. Bazeia, *Phys.*
Rev. **D43** (1991) 4074.
- [48] R. Wang, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **137** (1991) 587.
- [49] J. Spruck and Y. Yang, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **149** (1992) 361.
- [50] S.K. Kim and H. Min, *Phys. Lett.* **B281** (1992) 81.
- [51] N. Manton, *Phys. Lett.* **B110** (1982) 54 ; *Phys. Lett.* **B154** (1985) 397.
- [52] A. Khare, *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) R 2287.
- [53] C. Lee, K. Lee and H. Min, *Phys. Lett.* **B252** (1990) 79.
- [54] R. Jackiw and S-Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 2969 ; *Phys. Rev.*
D42 (1990) 3500.

- [55] S.K. Kim, W. Namgung, K.S. Soh and J.H. Yee, *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 1882.
- [56] S.K. Kim, K.S. Soh and J.H. Yee, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 4139.
- [57] F. Wilczek and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51** (1983) 2250.
- [58] Y.-S. Wu and A. Zee, *Phys. Lett.* **B147** (1984) 325 ; A.M. Din and W. J. Zakrzewski, **B146** (1984) 341.
- [59] See for example, A. Lerda, *Anyons: Quantum Mechanics of Particles with Fractional Statistics*, Lecture Notes in Phys. m14 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1992) and references therein.